

Date: Thu, 27 Oct 94 04:30:10 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #508  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 27 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 508

Today's Topics:

    NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins  
    Questions on this and that

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Tue, 25 Oct 94 22:58:22 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

Steve Wolf <sww@csuohio.edu> writes:

>Because we use error correction causing a "connect" to be required does  
>not change the fact that a packet radio bulletin is a one way transmission.

It most certainly \*does.\* If you can't transmit, how can you receive the  
bulletin?

-----  
Date: Thu, 27 Oct 1994 01:37:58 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Subject: Questions on this and that

myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com writes:

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>djenkins@jetson.uh.edu (David Jenkins) writes:

>>>2) I heard WB9RUM talking to a CBAGV (I'm pretty sure) on CW last night.

>>Might it have been C6AGV? Or even CB1GV is a possibility - some folks,  
>>after the first exchange of callsigns, may shorten the numeric charac-  
>>tor to just the first two elements: A = 1, N = 6, T = 0 (not legal!).

>What isn't legal? As long as no one is encoding text to obscure meaning,  
>and properly identify with a complete callsign every ten minutes (for US  
>amateurs), the callsign may be abbreviated.

>

>What makes you think this isn't legal?

The 10-minute ID is what I had in mind, Dana. But I still wouldn't test  
the FCC regarding this. Along these lines:

Here's a cute anecdote provided by Chuck K5F0: During the late 50's,  
the phrase 'Shave and a haircut - two bits' became popular on  
either the broadcast AM radio or TV (might have been a commercial).  
Hams started using the first part (. ... .) in place of CQ on  
HF. Another station hearing the psudo-CQ would answer with the  
'two bits' part: . . and the QSO would then take off. This  
got very popular with US hams but the FCC took a dim view of it  
and started handing out lots of pink slips. The dit dit is still  
retained on HF today - you'll hear a CW op end a QSO with that.

Why would the FCC not like the . ... . / . . exchange in  
place of CQ and the proper response? Only recognized prosigns  
are to be used on CW. Thus, I wouldn't test the FCC regarding  
sending an A or N or T in place of 1 or 6 or 0, respectively,  
with regard to a callsign exchange.

Jeff NH6IL

-----

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 94 22:56:54 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<389n39\$5at@ccnet.ccnet.com> <38gkij\$11p@yoda.Syntex.Com>,  
<38h4mn\$q72@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

Todd Little <little@iamu.chi.dec.com> writes:

>In addition, the actual messages in any PBBS are relayed to \*specific\*

>stations, i.e. they are \*not\* broadcast. If the FCC is going to start  
>limiting the content of amateur communication to the extent described  
>in the original post, then we have a serious problem. All those roundtables  
>on 75 meters talking about their hemorrhoids and gallstones are in for  
>big trouble. ;-)

Now there's a good point -- is an ALLUS message (for example) readily  
accessible, over amateur radio, to someone who can't transmit? W1AW bulletins  
and Newslines certainly are -- that's why the FCC restricts their content to  
prevent such bulletins from being used to broadcast to the general public. I  
don't see how a transmission between PBBSes, which can only be read either as  
it's being sent to the PBBSes or upon request on the PBBS's frequency, would  
flout the one-way rule.

-----

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 94 23:04:10 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<389n39\$5at@ccnet.ccnet.com> <19940ct24.205835.11821@news.csuohio.edu>,  
<19940ct25.145652.1856@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> writes:

>With W1AW all you \*can\* do is listen, because they don't monitor  
>the frequencies on which they broadcast.

Hmmm...does that mean that, if a QSO is in progress on the frequency, that they  
are causing interference?

-----

Date: Wed, 26 Oct 1994 06:11:22 GMT  
From: kevin@beacons.cts.com (Kevin Sanders)

References<kevin.jessup.51.002D3402@mail.mei.com> <FiHNuc4w165w@lmr.mv.com>,  
<Cy6MMI.B56@wang.com>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

In article <Cy6MMI.B56@wang.com> dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

>

>As many have said, this newsgroup is more relaxed as far as what we  
>can and can't post. What would happen, though, if that guy posted a  
>cookie recipe on rec.radio.amateur.misc? He'd get flamed off the net.  
>He would be told that this is not the place to post cookie recipes.

>

>Ditto for the Packet BBS system.

>

[ Note I removed .misc from Newsgroups: line ]

This is not a valid analogy. Cookie recipes belong in a newsgroup other than the rec.radio.amateur.\* groups, but how does one choose an appropriate "newsgroup" within the context of packet bulletins?

This is a deficiency of the packet bulletin system which I as a longtime Usenet Junkie find glaring. I have tried perusing packet BBSs and the difficulty of sorting out topics of interest is only matched by the frustration of the slow response ;-)

Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ  
kevin@beacons.cts.com

```
-----  
| o o \_/ o o |  
| o o @ o o |  
-----
```

Try Boatanchors  
For A Real Lift

-----  
Date: Wed, 26 Oct 1994 01:15:56 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<9410230400083420@pcappbbs.com> <Cy4yx7.8r3@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<RFM.940ct24155951@urth.eng.sun.com>  
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu  
Subject: The (1929) Amateur Code

rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>dale.piedfort@pcappbbs.com (Dale Piedfort) writes:

>>>THREE:

>>>

>>>THE AMATEUR IS PROGRESSIVE....He keeps his station abreast of science.

>>>It is well-built and efficient. His operating practice is above re-

>> ^^^^^^^^^^^

>>>proach.

>>If the above code is a mark of a REAL HAM then you have eliminated

>>not only all the no-codes but many of the know-codes, too - maybe

>>maybe even yourself!

>>Notice that the 'progressive' amateur above (in 1929) built \*everything\*  
>>in his station.

>Whoo-ha! Jeff, it said \*well-built\* not self-built. And even if  
>it were self-built, what evidence do you have that this would  
>eliminate all the no-codes?

Show me a \*commercially\* built amateur transmitter/receiver for the  
1929 ham, Rich! Just what do you think was available back then?

And even if there was one (which there wasn't), it would have been  
up to the manufacturer, not the ham, to insure it was ``well-built''.

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: 26 Oct 1994 06:43:57 GMT  
From: myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers)

References<Cy4yx7.8r3@news.Hawaii.Edu> <RFM.940ct24155951@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
<Cy9A6K.CAM@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject: Re: The (1929) Amateur Code

In article <Cy9A6K.CAM@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:  
>rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>  
>>Whoo-ha! Jeff, it said \*well-built\* not self-built. And even if  
>>it were self-built, what evidence do you have that this would  
>>eliminate all the no-codes?  
>  
>Show me a \*commercially\* built amateur transmitter/receiver for the  
>1929 ham, Rich! Just what do you think was available back then?  
>  
>And even if there was one (which there wasn't), it would have been  
>up to the manufacturer, not the ham, to insure it was ``well-built''.

Not exactly, Jeff. A "well-built" station can refer to equipment  
that is well-constructed, but I tend to think it means something  
more; a well-put-together station. A station with adequate  
lighting, adequate room, safely connected equipment. More than  
just a transmitter and receiver.

Anyway, even when you buy equipment, it isn't the manufacturer that  
is held responsible for the proper operation of the station; it is  
the station licensee. In other words, the ham is always the  
the one to insure the station and equipment therein, is  
"well-built".

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer \*  
\* "Antenna waves be burnin' up my radio" -- ZZ Top \*

-----  
Date: Wed, 26 Oct 1994 07:45:25 -500 CDT  
From: pwalker@mbi.moody.edu (Paul D. Walker II)

References<CxyIn2.LMM@news.Hawaii.Edu> <1994Oct20.115948.17421@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<RFM.94Oct25104434@urth.eng.sun.com>  
Subject: Re: Even a blind pig finds an acorn now and then

In article <RFM.94Oct25104434@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>In article <pwalker.191.008A28E9@mbi.moody.edu> pwalker@mbi.moody.edu (Paul D. Walker II) writes:

>>What incentive would he have had to even \*try\* {CW} had he not  
>>been required to learn it first?

>Perhaps other hams might have described to him the fun things they do  
>with CW?

>I'm beginning to wonder if the code requirement is actually \*keeping\* many  
>people from trying code. If the only way people can be motivated to use it  
>is by bludgeoning them with the law, it must not be much fun, eh?

Amateur Radio must not be fun at all, since we are all bludgeoned with the  
requirement that all must be licensed to operate legally.

-----  
Date: Wed, 26 Oct 94 13:38:13 GMT  
From: rdewan@uhura.cc.rochester.edu (Rajiv Dewan)

References<389n39\$5at@ccnet.ccnet.com> <Cy3Buq.9s8@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<38k0lg\$5jt@kelly.teleport.com>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

In article <38k0lg\$5jt@kelly.teleport.com> genew@teleport.com (Gene Wolford) writes:

>Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:

>: rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>

>: >This was found floating on the Amateur Packet BBS system. What do you think?

>  
 >: I think it's always in the benefit of the ARS when a clarification  
 >: of the rules are made in advance to violation notices being handed  
 >: out. All it probably took was for a few to stretch what was considered  
 >: appropriate use of packet for this clarification to be made.  
 >  
 >: On the back of our license it says, in part, 'Operation of the station  
 >: shall be in accordance with Part 97 of the Commission's Rules.' Our  
 >: signature on the front binds us to this statement.  
 >  
 >: If someone has a problem with this 00 and this clarification, I hear  
 >: that packet might now be in use on the CB frequencies....  
 >  
 >: >\*\*\* Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all  
 >: >\*\*\* that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.  
 >: >\*\*\* 73 George K7WWA @ K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM  
 >  
 >: Boring maybe, but legal!  
 >: Jeff NH6IL  
 >  
 >Oh, goody. We can all snooze away in compliance.  
 >All bow to the mighty ARRL, (Anally Retentive Regulation Lovers).  
 >Beware the dreaded "00"s, (Kilocycle Kops).  
 >Heil!

You have clearly missed the whole point of amateur radio in US being  
 a self policing hobby. Would you like ham radio turn into the chaos  
 of CB?

Rajiv  
 double a neuf ch

-----  
 Date: Wed, 26 Oct 1994 23:15:51 GMT  
 From: no8m@hamnet.wariat.org (Steve Wolf N08M)

References<kevin.jessup.51.002D3402@mail.mei.com> <FiHNuc4w165w@lmr.mv.com>,  
 <CyAM6E.6zG@cscsun.rmc.edu>  
 Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

>What 'One Way' bulletins??? What this idiot 00 forgets is the each and every  
 ...snip

>David Tiller | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-3710 |  
 >dtiller@rmc.edu | n2kau/4 | Randolph-Macon College| Fax: (804) 752-7231 |

Your reference to "idiot 00" negated the need to reply.

73,  
Steve

internet : no8m@hamnet.wariat.org  
packet : no8m@no8m.#neoh.oh.usa.na  
MSYS Mail List: msys-request@hamnet.wariat.org ("info" for subject)

-----  
Date: Wed, 26 Oct 1994 05:46:21 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<CxuK0B.68C@metronet.com> <Cy28nF.KA2@news.hawaii.edu>,  
<Cy7G36.7Br@metronet.com>  
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu  
Subject: Re: CW: Law or Choice ?

dismondo@metronet.com (Ray Whitfield) writes:

>Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@oh.no.a.bad.address.sorry.angus> wrote:

>>dismondo@metronet.com (Ray Whitfield) writes:

>>>CW once was the only game in town.  
>>>Now it is a part of the game, and one that is loosing popularity daily.

>>Ray, can you provide us with some data to back up your statement?  
>>At least when I claim that about 1/2 the HF QSO's that I hear  
>>here in the Central Pacific are conducted via CW, I can back  
>>up that claim by showing folks my monitoring log with times,  
>>dates, and bands.

> Just as you use the modes you like best; I use the ones I like best.  
>All of my contacts are FM phone. Not once have I ever heard a Code contact  
>on 2m or 70 cm. But I do not base my opinion on just my contacts on the  
>air. Rather at every HAM event I have ever been to, no one there used  
>code. Even on FIELD DAY, the Coppel HAM club did not use CODE while I  
>was present and I am told that it was not employed for anything other  
>than catching the W1AW message for points. If you do not employ any  
>mode (or tune into any band that is commonly used for that mode ) then  
>you will never take part in that mode. ( same for me too ) I can also tell  
>you that the Irving ( it is to the west and little bit north of Dallas )  
>Amateur Radio club has three VHF/UHF repeaters and lots of equipment for  
>Phone contacts including autopatches on all three units. They have no



CW has never been as prevalent above 30 MHz as it has been (is) below 30 MHz, so for you to say it's losing popularity daily (above 30 MHz) is not a completely truthful statement.

During Field Day the CW subbands are jammed with stations, so one might surmise that the Coppel Ham Club might have a collection of folks that have just tech licenses and were operating during Field Day under a coded licensee on HF. And it sounds like Irving ARC is a V/UHF oriented club. There's a lot of factors to take into account prior to making a statement such as ``...code is losing popularity daily.''

I invite you to listen to the HF CW subbands occasionally!

.73 Watts output from Hawaii,  
Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Wed, 26 Oct 1994 12:55:46 GMT  
From: phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com (Paul H. Bock)

References<RFM.94Oct24155951@urth.eng.sun.com> <Cy9A6K.CAM@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<38ktrd\$6i5@abyss.West.Sun.COM>  
Subject: Re: The (1929) Amateur Code

myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>In article <Cy9A6K.CAM@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:  
>>rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:  
>>  
>>Show me a \*commercially\* built amateur transmitter/receiver for the  
>>1929 ham, Rich! Just what do you think was available back then?

A lot more than you are aware of, obviously. While it is true that hams of that era built their own transmitters as a rule, there were indeed commercial receivers available, bought and used by hams.

According to magazine ads of that era, it would also seem that there were many "ready-built" components available which would have simplified construction somewhat.

Tomorrow I will post what I can find in the way of "ready-built" equipment descriptions, which date back to the early '20s, in some cases.

>>And even if there was one (which there wasn't), it would have been  
>>up to the manufacturer, not the ham, to insure it was ``well-built''.

Better read the FCC regs again, Jeff. It is *\*never\** up to the manufacturer to ensure that a piece of equipment *\*once installed in a station\** complies with the FCC regulations for purity, stability, etc., etc. It is *\*always\** the responsibility of the station licensee. The FCC does not inspect every piece of manufactured equipment to see that it complies, it merely tests a sample and then depends on the manufacturer to ensure that all units comply. If your rig "gets you in trouble" with the FCC you can try filing suit against the manufacturer (lots of luck!) and if it happens a lot the FCC may take a closer look at the manufacturer, but in the final analysis it is *\*always\** the licensee who is responsible (that's why your station is *\*licensed\**, to ensure that *\*someone\** is responsible for it).

>Not exactly, Jeff. A "well-built" station can refer to equipment  
>that is well-constructed, but I tend to think it means something  
>more; a well-put-together station. A station with adequate  
>lighting, adequate room, safely connected equipment. More than  
>just a transmitter and receiver.

Read "200 Meters and Down" for a historical perspective on this issue. The problem in those days was that a lot of the wonderful, homebuilt stations Jeff is crowing about had *\*abominable\** signals: Chirp, drift, lots of AC modulation (from using raw AC on the plates), out of band (very common in those days), etc. All of which made the amateurs look like - well, amateurs! ARRL was so concerned about the public image this created (by the way, BCI was a *\*real\** nuisance then, as bad or worse than the worst days of TVI in the '50s) that a lot of effort was put into getting hams to "clean up their act." Had that not been done, the support that the U.S. Government had always given to protecting amateur frequency allocations at the international conferences (where most of the rest of the world wanted to ban amateur radio once and for all) might have dwindled and we might all be talking on the Internet instead of the radio. :-) As it turned out, amateurs did finally clean up their signal quality and operating habits (some very grudgingly, BTW) but even so, retaining amateur allocations always has been (and still is) a close-run thing.

>Anyway, even when you buy equipment, it isn't the manufacturer that  
>is held responsible for the proper operation of the station; it is  
>the station licensee. In other words, the ham is always the  
>the one to insure the station and equipment therein, is  
>"well-built".

Correct.

One final note: It was in the 'teens that "amateur wireless" began to take on a distictly different character, from "wireless experimenters" to "wireless communicators." In other words, the enthusiasts were more interested in communicating on the radio than just tinkering with it. This is what led HPM to form the ARRL and establish the first nationwide trunk lines. It was a fortuitous move, because had that not happened and the aspect of "amateur radio as a public service medium" never developed, there is little doubt that the U.S. Government, tired of amateur wireless interference to commercial and government interests and seeing no "saving grace" to the hobby but merely a bunch of obnoxious, unorganized attic tinkers, would not have supported amateur frequency allocations at the international conferences and amateur radio would hve been banned.

Remember that, even in the 1920s, many European countries would not allow their amateurs to communicate with other countries. One Swiss ham had his license cancelled, his station confiscated, and all his logbooks, notes, correspondence and postcards (the forerunners of the modern QSL card) conficated because he had contacts with other countries.

73 DE K4MSG

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #508  
\*\*\*\*\*